



Calvert, I. (2017). Trojan Pretenders: Dryden's *The Last Parting of Hector and Andromache*, Jacobitism, and *Translatio Imperii*. *Translation and Literature*, 26(1), 1-22.
<https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2017.0273>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.3366/tal.2017.0273](https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2017.0273)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Edinburgh University Press at <https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/abs/10.3366/tal.2017.0273> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Trojan Pretenders: Dryden's *The Last Parting*
of *Hector and Andromache*, Jacobitism, and *Translatio Imperii*

Ian Calvert

Dryden's *The Last Parting of Hector and Andromache*, first published in the 1693 miscellany *Exammen Poeticum*, translates the celebrated passage from *Iliad* 6 in which the Trojan prince Hector tells his wife Andromache why he cannot obey her entreaty to stay at home but must instead return to the fighting.¹ Before he leaves he takes their infant son Astyanax into his arms and prays that the gods will give him a glorious future. Hector prays for this outcome despite his awareness that Troy 'shall perish by the *Grecian* Rage' (115) and that his family will almost certainly be killed or forced into exile.² Scholarship by Howard Erskine-Hill and Robin Sowerby has established how Dryden used the translation to mark the birth of James Francis Edward Stuart (the 'Old Pretender') and the political repercussions of this event.³ The links between the infant James and Astyanax, rather than being stated directly, are made apparent when the poem is placed within a network of contemporary events and the literary works related to them.

What has not hitherto been discussed are the affinities between the commemorative aspect of *The Last Parting* and a traditional interpretation of classical epic. Crucially for the poem, this interpretation emerged not through readings of the *Iliad* but of Homer's successor, Virgil. Servius' widely cited and influential commentary on the *Aeneid* claimed that Virgil's intention was 'Homerum imitari et Augustam laudare a parentibus' (1.4; 'to imitate Homer and to praise Augustus through his ancestors').⁴ Dryden notes in his Dedication to the *Aeneis* how this praise emerged from 'the receiv'd Opinion, that the *Romans* were descended from the *Trojans*, and *Julius Cæsar* from *Iulus* the Son of *Æneas*' (*Works*, V, 281-2), and how Augustus, Julius Caesar's great-nephew and adopted son, was 'shadow'd in the Person of

Aeneas' (*Works*, V, 283). The present essay discusses how, in *The Last Parting*, Dryden used an adaptation of this Virgilian tradition that ascribed Trojan ancestry to James Francis Edward Stuart's family. The child's father, James II, imitated Augustus and traced his ancestry to Iulus (also known as Ascanius); his mother, Mary of Modena, was a supposed descendant of Astyanax. Inviting comparisons between these infant princes in his translation allowed Dryden both to commemorate the birth of a royal heir and to celebrate how his Trojan inheritance lent his claim to supreme authority an added legitimacy; for Catholic Jacobites the Stuarts' Trojan ancestry also offered a riposte to the Saxon origins that were proclaimed for William III's paternal line and the English Protestant Church.⁵ The various fates that classical epic poets had granted to Ascanius and Astyanax also enabled Dryden to address the precariousness of James Francis Edward's future, its ramifications for his dynasty, and his own status as a national poet.

Dryden's assertion of James Francis Edward's Trojan ancestry corresponded with the seventeenth-century reception of *translatio imperii* (the transfer of *imperium*, 'supreme power'). Jacques Le Goff has discussed the historical circumstances which helped inspire the development of this concept during late antiquity, and has linked it primarily to the interpretation of biblical prophecies concerning the rise and fall of empires.⁶ However, the rationale behind *translatio imperii* also owed much to Virgil and to the *Aeneid*'s reception of Homer. Virgil drew on the tradition that, unlike Hector, Aeneas survived the fall of Troy, led a group of Trojan survivors into exile, settled in Italy, and founded the nation which later became Rome. In doing so, Virgil followed a prophecy in the *Iliad* which stated that Aeneas was destined to rule over the Trojans (*Iliad* 20.306-8). The site of power had originated in Troy but had moved westward to Rome.

Translatio imperii is as much concerned with the inheritance of power as with its transferral. The *Aeneid* emphasizes how Rome inherited the *imperium* of its great

predecessor. Virgil has the spirit of Hector come to Aeneas in a dream on the last night of Troy. Hector informs Aeneas (*Aeneid* 2.268-97) that Troy is fated to fall, and that he must flee the city in order to guide the Trojan survivors to a new land.⁷ This instruction asserts Aeneas' status as Hector's chosen heir of his *imperium*. The *Aeneid* intimates that Augustus had, in turn, inherited this status thanks to his position as the ruler of the Roman people and as Aeneas' direct lineal descendant. From late antiquity onwards, several European nations followed the Augustan example: they endorsed the concept of *translatio imperii* in order to legitimize their claims to political supremacy and to add grandeur to their own mythography. Just as *imperium* had moved from Troy to Rome, so, it was argued, it had moved again following the fall of the Roman empire. The centre of each new empire was held to exist on the margins of its predecessor. This too has its origins in Virgilian mythography. In the *Aeneid* the part of Italy in which Aeneas settles, Latium, is presented as a place of deep obscurity. The Italian King Evander tells Aeneas that Saturn (another ruler forced into exile) gave this region the name of Latium 'his quoniam latuisset tutus in oris' (*Aeneid* 8.323, 'since in these shores he had grown safe, hidden away'). 'Latium' puns on *latere*, 'to lie hidden', which Dryden replicated by using the word 'lay' in his translation of the line as 'And *Latium* call'd the Land where safe he lay' (*Aeneis* 8.429). As the site of the future Rome, this marginal location is destined to become the centre of the world.

Virgil's only direct reference to Britain's geographical location helped English writers to engage with this tradition. In the *Eclogues* the shepherd Meliboeus fears exile amongst 'penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos' (*Ecl.* 1.66, 'the Britons, completely cut off from the rest of the world'). By the second half of the seventeenth century Britain had experienced sufficient imperial success to inspire the notion that London was imitating Rome's progress: once on the fringes of the world, it was rapidly becoming its metropolis. Dryden's own

panegyrics from the 1660s often claimed that Britain had become the new Latium and that *imperium* had transferred to London from Rome.⁸

Such assertions of English *imperium* were required to acknowledge that this transferral and inheritance of power had occurred indirectly; *imperium* had first passed from Rome to other Continental powers before reaching Britain. This reflected both historical realities and mythological precedent. R. E. Asher has traced the post-Roman continuation of the *translatio imperii* tradition, and claims of a Trojan descent as proof of this continuation, to mid-seventh century Merovingian France. The legend was later refined at the turn of the thirteenth century to provide a specific Trojan lineage for the French monarchy.⁹ Both versions drew on the tradition that, like Aeneas, a son of Hector survived Troy's fall, went into exile, and founded a dynasty.¹⁰ The first chroniclers who made this claim stated that the Valois, then the ruling house of France, could trace their ancestry back to the earliest French kings, who were themselves descended from Astyanax. Astyanax is the only son of Hector to appear in the *Iliad* and so, within this tradition, was the most likely candidate for the founding father. A number of literary works, most significantly Ronsard's national epic *La Françiad* and Racine's tragedy *Andromaque*, endorsed this myth and applied it to successive French sovereigns. In the preface to *Andromaque* Racine asks:

qui ne sait que l'on fait descendre nos anciens rois de ce fils d'Hector, et que nos vieilles chroniques sauvent la vie à ce jeune prince, après la désolation de son pays, pour en faire le fondateur de notre monarchie?

(who does not know that our kings of olden times are supposed to be descended from this son of Hector's, and that our ancient chronicles save this young prince's life after his country is laid waste, so as to make of him the founder of our monarchy?)¹¹

Racine's tone here suggests that he was writing with a knowledge of Andromache's prediction in the *Iliad* (24.726-38) that the Greeks will conquer Troy, and so Astyanax would more likely be killed than be forced into exile. Virgil's Andromache confirms her Homeric counterpart's prediction (*Aeneid* 3.339-41, 488-91) and this became the predominant version of the myth. Astyanax's death as an infant should preclude any claims of descent; Racine, like Ronsard, has had to side-step Virgilian precedent to claim that Astyanax survived Troy. Dryden's knowledge of this tradition most likely came via Racine: his account of Astyanax as 'The Pledge of Love, and other hope of *Troy*' (*The Last Parting*, 143) expands upon the Homeric 'φίλον υἱόν' (*Iliad* 6.474, 'dear son') to combine two descriptions of Astyanax in *Andromaque*.¹² This acknowledges Astyanax's status as the last of the Trojans and, despite the Virgilian example, the first of a new dynasty.

This French tradition came to be applied to the Italian branch of the House of Este. In the *Orlando innamorato* (II.xxi.55-60) Boiardo made the paladin Ruggiero the founding father of the Estense, and has Ruggiero trace his own ancestry back to Astyanax (3.v.17-34); Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* reiterated Ruggiero's line of descent.¹³ Tasso, the Estense's next great court poet, departed from this tradition to claim another figure, Rinaldo, as the dynasty's founding father.¹⁴ This is partly because the *Gerusalemme liberata* is centred more on historical events than on myths; Tasso has (the quasi-historical) Rinaldo descend from (the historical) Azzo II, whose castle at Este gave the dynasty its name (see *GL* XVII.25-31). However, Tasso's Rinaldo frequently recalls Ariosto's Ruggiero; he is a poetical son of Ruggiero, if not his direct descendant.¹⁵ Rinaldo's shadowing of Ruggiero ensured that Tasso did not entirely dismiss the tradition of tracing the ancestry of the Estense's founding father back to Astyanax.

This connection between Astyanax and the Estense became pertinent to Dryden, and other Stuart loyalists, after the 1673 marriage of the Estense princess Mary of Modena to the

future James II. Dryden dedicated *The State of Innocence* to Mary and flattered her by referring to her familial associations with Ariosto and Tasso:

I can yield, without envy, to the Nation of Poets, the family of *Este* to which *Ariosto* and *Tasso* have ow'd their Patronage; and to which the World has ow'd their Poems:
But I could not without extream reluctance resign the Theme of Your Beauty to another Hand.

(*Works*, XII, 81)

Mary herself was not directly descended from the Estense who were celebrated by Ariosto and Tasso, but enough of a link existed between her and these individuals for this reference not to appear too forced or strained.¹⁶

James II could, like his wife, claim descent from Astyanax, although this was the result of his dynastic ties to the French royal line (thanks to his mother Henrietta Maria) rather than any connection with the Estense prior to their marriage. Such a claim was not pressed; the British reception of *translatio imperii* privileged a different ancestor for James and the Stuarts. The earliest recorded claim of Trojan descent for the British is in the *Historia Britonnum*, a work attributed to the early ninth-century monk Nennius.¹⁷ Nennius probably imitated the established French tradition but, as Dryden himself acknowledged, the British version followed Virgilian precedent more closely. It derived descent, not from Hector, but from Aeneas:

the whole *Roman* People were oblig'd by *Virgil*, in deriving them from *Troy*; an Ancestry which they affected. We, and the *French* are of the same Humour: They

would be thought to descend from a Son, I think, of *Hector*: And we wou'd have our
Britain, both Nam'd and Planted by a descendant of *Æneas*.

(*Works*, V, 283)

Nennius claimed that the name 'Britain' came from the nation's founder, Brutus, a descendent of Aeneas' posthumous son Silvius. Geoffrey of Monmouth's *The History of the Kings of Britain* reasserted the Nennius myth but claimed Brutus as the descendant of Ascanius, not Silvius, and made Brutus the founder of the British royal line as well as of the British nation.¹⁸ Geoffrey's account was challenged more or less from its first dissemination but this did not significantly dent its popularity and influence.¹⁹

The origins of a more widely disseminated and more sceptical reception of Geoffrey's *History* in the early modern period are traditionally traced to Polydore Vergil's *Angliae Historiae*. Even Vergil, however, did not reject the myth outright; instead he treated it as a reported fable rather than as a historical truth.²⁰ Vergil may have helped establish a more equivocal tone, but the myth continued to have its champions. Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles*, along with other histories, still accepted the Brutus foundation story uncritically.²¹ It also continued to play a significant role in royal panegyric, most notably in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Spenser hailed King Arthur as the ancestor of the Tudors, and asserted the Trojan origins of Arthur's own lineage: he is 'anciently deriu'd | From roiall stocke of old *Assaracs* line'.²² This recalls Aeneas' own ancestor Assaracus. Dryden too has Arthur assert a Trojan genealogy: in his operatic *King Arthur* the protagonist calls Aeneas 'my Fam'd Ancestor' (V.ii.30). This, along with Dryden's reference to the 'old *Trojan* Stock' of the British in the Epilogue to his 1679 adaptation of *Troilus and Cressida* (line 5), suggests that the myth still had a general currency in the late seventeenth century, even if it was accepted as more of a poetic truth.

Milton's *History of Britain*, the major historical account of Britain's Trojan origins published closest in time to Dryden's own uses of the myth, acknowledged it to be spurious but still found it worthy of consideration, 'be it for nothing else but in favour of our English Poets, and Rhetoricians, who by thir Art will know, how to use them judiciously'.²³ Milton may have included himself within these poets: in *Epitaphium Damonis* he intimates that he will make Brutus the subject of his national epic. His 'Ipse ego Dardanias Rutupina per aequora puppes | Dicam' (162-3; 'I myself will tell of Trojan ships on the Kentish seas') must refer to the fleet supposedly commanded by Brutus.²⁴ Milton's ultimate decision not to give the Brutus story epic treatment probably reflects his awareness of its use to support royal legitimacy.²⁵

This aspect of the Trojan foundation myth highlights the likely status of *The Last Parting* as a poem that reflects on royal events. The continental and British traditions ensured that any child of James II and Mary of Modena could claim descent from both Ascanius and Astyanax. Dryden's use of direct references to Ascanius in the Astyanax of *The Last Parting* helps support this connection. In calling Astyanax 'The Pledge of Love, and other hope of Troy' Dryden alludes both to Racine and to Virgil's description of Ascanius as 'magnae spes altera Romae' (*Aeneid* 12.168, 'the other hope of great Rome'). The allusion draws attention to Astyanax's status as an heir apparent and as the future founder of a European dynasty; the translation praises James Francis Edward Stuart through his Trojan ancestors.

This allusion to Ascanius also conforms to the highly Virgilian framework of *The Last Parting*. Dryden's aesthetic approach in general was, of course, highly indebted to Virgil. In much of his poetry he sought to bring English verse to its highest point of refinement and polish. As he felt Virgil had done the same for Latin poetry, the best way to achieve this in English was to model his own poetry on Virgilian lines.²⁶ This remains an important context for the translation in terms of its tone as well as its versification. The

translation is characterized not just by a Virgilian poetics but also by a Virgilian melancholy. Dryden felt that Homer was in general ‘ambitious enough of moving pity’ (*Works*, IV, 373), but in the the *Last Parting* episode had not elicited pity or grief strongly enough, so these emotions needed to be amplified in translation. Drawing on Virgil, who was regarded as a poet of deep pathos as well as of aesthetic supremacy, was the most effective means of achieving this. Dryden’s Hector places great emphasis on his inescapable fate, which he calls ‘th’ irrevocable Doom of Destiny’ (182). This brings him much closer to the shade of Hector which appears in the *Aeneid* than to his living counterpart in the *Iliad*. The terrible futures that Dryden’s Hector imagines for himself and Andromache in *The Last Parting* appear as certainties, not possibilities. Underlinings here represent additions to the Homeric narrative:²⁷

The fatal Day draws on, when I must fall;

And Universal Ruine cover all. ...

I see, I see thee in that fatal Hour,

Subjected to the Victor’s cruel Pow’r:

Led hence a Slave to some insulting Sword:

Forlorn and trembling at a Foreign Lord:

(116-17; 124-7)

Poems, IV, 321-2 records how Dryden’s expansions in this passage allude to Aeneas’ account of Troy’s fall, but they also draw on the passage in *Aeneid* 3 in which Andromache tells Aeneas of her experiences in exile (3.294-355). For Dryden the *Aeneid* is much more than a convenient source of pathos. Its account of Andromache’s post-Trojan fate helps emphasize the validity of Hector’s fears at this moment of the episode.

The Virgilian aspects of *The Last Parting*, particularly its references to Ascanius, highlight how Astyanax is doomed to die at Troy. The prospect of this event casts a shadow over the translation as a whole. This increases the discrepancy between the future that Hector hopes Astyanax will experience and his awareness that this future is impossible to attain:

Parent of Gods, and Men, propitious Jove,
 And you bright Synod of the Pow'rs above;
On this my Son your Gracious Gifts bestow;
 Grant him to live, and great in Arms to grow:
 To Reign in *Troy*; to Govern with Renown:
To shield the People, and assert the Crown:
 That, when hereafter he from War shall come,
And bring his Trojans Peace and Triumph home,
 Some aged Man, who lives this act to see,
And who in former times remember'd me,
 May say the Son in Fortitude and Fame
 Out-goes the Mark; and drowns his Father's Name:
 That at these words his Mother may rejoyce:
And add her Suffrage to the publick Voice.

(156-69)

Some of Dryden's additions here relate to broader aspects of the *translatio imperii* tradition. Dryden's Astyanax is imagined to possess the supreme power of the military and civic authorities: 'Govern with Renown' indicates a chief magistracy, 'Triumph home' suggests the welcome granted to a victorious general (see *Poems*, IV, 324). These two types of power were, for the Romans, the only manifestations of *imperium*. This encourages readers familiar

with Virgil to recognize that fate has transferred the future which Hector envisions for Astyanax to Ascanius. It is Ascanius, and not Astyanax, who is destined to become Troy's heir and lead its people (and its *imperium*) from Asia to Italy. Such moments serve to amplify the potential glory, and subsequently the realized loss, of Astyanax's and Troy's future. Hector's wish that his son's achievements will exceed those of his father is a futile one. It was precisely because Astyanax died and Troy fell that Rome was able to rise. Dryden's Hector has transferred the manifestations of one imperial power back to its predecessor, which he imagines as flourishing beyond its known historical span.

For Stuart loyalists such as Dryden the birth of James Francis Edward had resulted in a similar experience. His allusion to Astyanax as Troy's 'other Hope' helps acknowledge this. English panegyrists had frequently used or alluded to the original Latin phrase *spes altera* to hail a royal individual as the heir apparent. The first occurrence of this tradition in print dates to the mid-sixteenth century,²⁸ and it became sufficiently established under the Stuarts that, by 1688, it had turned into a familiar motif. James II himself had been hailed as the nation's *spes altera* throughout his brother's reign: at Charles II's coronation the triumphal arch dedicated to celebrating James' achievements contained the motto *spes altera*.²⁹ The events of 1688 proved that James' own heir had more in common with Astyanax than he did with Ascanius. Exiled, and at risk of death, his *imperium* had passed to a junior branch of his dynasty.

Dryden's translation was completed by October 1692.³⁰ As *Poems* IV, 314-15 outlines, however, the portrayal of Hector's family in the translation has strong parallels with Dryden's presentation of James II's family in *Britannia Rediviva*, a poem published barely a fortnight after James Francis Edward's birth. This suggests either that both poems were written at around the same time or that *The Last Parting* consciously drew on a precedent established in *Britannia Rediviva*. Howard Erskine-Hill has suggested that *The Last Parting*

recalls two occasions when James II parted from his wife and son: the first in December 1688, when he sent them to France in response to William of Orange's advance on London, the second in March 1689, when, having joined them in exile, James left for Ireland in an attempt to regain his crown.³¹ Whilst the parallels in both cases are certainly striking, they do not need to be rooted in quite such specific historical circumstances in order to acquire resonance. For Stuart loyalists, the hopes the child's birth represented were equivalent to those that Hector wishes for Astyanax, but they would also have recognized that the political landscape of 1688 made the prospect of his becoming king deeply unlikely.

The Last Parting acknowledges that James Francis Edward's birth should have been a source of great joy. The childless marriage of Charles II and Catherine of Braganza had ensured that there was increased pressure on other members of the dynasty to produce an heir. This pressure initially fell on James II's first wife Anne, Duchess of York. In their eleven years of marriage Anne had eight children, four sons and four daughters, but the majority of them died as young infants. Only two daughters (the future Queens Mary and Anne) survived into adulthood, and by 1688 neither of them had experienced a successful pregnancy. After Anne's death and James' remarriage the dynastic pressures were transferred to Mary of Modena. In the epilogue to a 1682 command performance of *Venice Preserv'd* (to which Dryden contributed the prologue) Otway called on Mary to 'bring safe the hour of joy | When some blest Tongue proclaims a Royal Boy'.³² Another poem written on the same occasion expressed this wish in a manner which glances at the Virgilian descent myth via the connection between Ascanius and Augustus:

Timely present to our impatient sight

The INFANT PRINCE, blest *Natures* sole delight.

Such are our wishes due to Heav'n-born *Grace*,

To YOU, and to Great *Cæsar*'s Princely Race.³³

Mary ultimately sought divine assistance to secure the Stuart succession. In his dedication (to Mary) of his 1688 translation of Dominique Bouhours' biography of the Jesuit missionary St Francis Xavier, Dryden notes how she 'has chosen this great Saint for one of your Cœlestial Patrons' (*Works*, XIX, 3). In doing so Mary was following the example of the French queen, Anne of Austria, who 'after twenty years of barrenness, had recourse to Heaven by her fervent Prayers, to draw down that blessing, and address'd her devotions in a particular manner, to this holy Apostle of the *Indies*' (*Works*, XIX, 3). The 'blessing' referred to here was Anne of Austria's son, Louis XIV, the dedicatee of Bouhours' original biography. Consequently, in the late seventeenth century, St Francis Xavier became known as an intercessor for securing a Catholic dynasty. It is likely (or so *Works*, XIX, 454-5 claims) that Dryden was commissioned to produce a translation of this saint's life on the announcement of Mary's pregnancy in 1688. It would explain Dryden's hope that 'the Nation may one day come to understand, how happy it will be for them to have a Son of Prayers ruling over them: Not that we are wholly to depend on this particular Blessing, as a thing of certainty, though we hope, and pray for its continuance' (*Works*, XIX, 3). Even here, however, Dryden is noticeably cautious. His account of her pregnancy calls it a 'blessing', but not 'a thing of certainty'.

Such caution arose from the knowledge of deeply unfortunate precedent. In the first fifteen years of her marriage Mary was pregnant ten times, but only four of these pregnancies came to term, and all four of these children died as infants between 1675 and 1681. A hostile squib drew a cruel comparison between James' two wives:

At first She'had ill success

With his Royal Highness,
 For no sooner was She a Mother
 But Her Children all Di'd,
 Like those of *Nan Hyde*,
 'Twas said of something or other.³⁴

The fervent anti-Catholic sentiments displayed elsewhere in this work indicate that this childlessness is seen as divine punishment for James and Anne's conversion to Catholicism. From this perspective Mary was even more deserving of opprobrium; she had been born a Catholic and was known for her religious devotion. Within this context it is understandable why Stuart loyalists portrayed the birth of James Francis Edward as a miraculous event: in *Britannia Rediviva* Dryden again calls the child a 'Son of Pray'rs' (35) to affirm that the birth is the result of divine intercession. It is also understandable that there was anxiety concerning the child's survival prospects.

James Francis Edward's birth caused Stuart panegyrists to reassert the tradition of praising someone through their ancestors. Like other royal events during this period, the birth prompted a verse miscellany from each of the English universities.³⁵ Some poems in these miscellanies presented the baby prince, as Dryden did in *The Last Parting*, as combining heroic bloodlines. A poem in the Cambridge miscellany celebrates his descent from two mythical heroes, although the emphasis is on post-classical, rather than Trojan, ancestry. It concentrates on Spenser, Ariosto, and Tasso over Homer or Virgil:

Expecting Nations waited on Your Womb
From it's Great Product to receive their Doom;
Within whose Royal Veins united joyn
The Blood of Este and the Scottish Line.

What Glorious Acts shall by his Arms be done
If by the Father we may judge the Son?
He shall surpass, when he to Man proceeds,
Your own Rinaldo's and our Arthurs deeds.
Heir to the Fame of each Illustrious Race
*How the Young Heroe does the Vanquish'd chase*³⁶

This poem draws only on quasi-historical figures in both royal houses: King Arthur (for the Stuarts) and Rinaldo (for the Estense). Dryden's *The Last Parting* engages with a Trojan genealogy to trace the ancestry of James Francis Edward back as far as possible. This context adds further nuance to an already equivocal text; the various accounts of Astyanax's fate are all kept in sight throughout Dryden's translation. This helps to create pathos in a way which references to Arthur and Rinaldo could not. Homer's Hector foresees his own death, the death of Priam, and of Troy itself; Dryden's Hector foresees the death of the Trojan royal line as well. In a deeply moving passage he tells Andromache:

Not *Troy* it self, tho' built by Hands Divine,
 Nor *Priam*, nor his People, nor his Line,
 My Mother, nor my Brothers of Renown,
Whose Valour yet defends th' unhappy Town,
 Not these, nor all their Fates which I foresee,
 Are half of that concern I have for thee.

(118-23)

This leaves much less hope of a smooth transition of power from father to son, or an instance of *translatio imperii* that combines inheritance with relocation. Dryden's Virgilian additions to the narrative raise this prospect only to remove it.

Other poems in the university miscellanies drew on the *spes altera* motif and acknowledged James Francis Edward's Trojan ancestry. As in *The Last Parting*, such references could be equivocal: one poem in the Oxford miscellany calls him 'spes Extrema Stuartum' (*Strenæ Natalitiæ*, sig. Q3^r 'the most recent hope of the Stuarts'). Since 'extrema' can mean 'last' or 'final', the praise here is somewhat cautious. A separately published poem sought to gloss over the dynastic tensions by moving the analogy forward a generation. The poet imagines a fully grown James Francis Edward as an Aeneas shouldering the burden of his father (James-Anchises):

Loud sounds the Fame of the Great *Latian* KING,
 Who from Burnt *Troy* did old *Anchises* bring ;
 The Fathers weight did the kind Son sustain,
 And paid the Life He gave him back again.
 Greater in *History* shall the PRINCE appear,
 If of *Your Virtues* He the weight can bear³⁷

Other poems demonstrated their caution by drawing on the Hector and Andromache episode itself. One adapted Hector's prayer and applied it James Francis Edward.³⁸ A Latin verse in the same miscellany (*Illustrissimi*, sig. K1^v) even presented him as an Astyanax, although Astyanax is not claimed as his ancestor. Such references allow for a variety of interpretations depending on which version of the Astyanax myth readers chose to privilege. They could predict a triumph of hope over reality; they could also represent an endorsement of the

continental tradition, indicate that this latter-day Astyanax has overcome Virgilian precedent, and suggest that he is destined for a glorious future.

This account of James Francis Edward's genealogy by Dryden and other poets indicates how the most nuanced claims of Trojan origin occurred during moments of dynastic tension. They acquired a particular charge either when there was no clear line of royal succession or when there had been a takeover by a new dynasty, which could involve the accession of a monarch who had gained the throne by displacing others who had a superior claim. In such cases forging a connection to a long-standing foundation myth could help grant some necessary legitimacy. It also had the potential to highlight the fragility of such a claim; the Trojan connections could either ring triumphant or hollow. Dynastic tensions may even have prompted the claim of descent from Ascanius in the first place. Despite Nennius' assertion of Trojan origins for the British, the later Anglo-Saxon monarchs did not make use of this myth; it only gained widespread currency post-Conquest.³⁹ Kellie Robertson has discussed how Geoffrey's *History* may have invented the idea of royal descent from Brutus to address a Norman succession crisis in the early twelfth century, and how, in turn, the first Plantagenet monarchs used it to sanction their 'shaky succession to the throne' from the Normans.⁴⁰ Later Plantagenets, in particular Edward IV, capitalized on the myth in order to assert their questionable claims. Henry VII, as the first Tudor monarch, drew heavily on the Welsh reception of Geoffrey's *History* for the same purpose.⁴¹ The myth received renewed attention on James VI and I's accession to the throne after Elizabeth I died childless and without naming an heir.⁴² In each case the dynasty proclaimed itself the only authentic descendants of the British founding father despite the fact that the previous dynasty or branch of the family had claimed exactly the same thing; with each new reassertion of *translatio imperii* there was both continuity and innovation.

Dryden's poems on James Francis Edward's birth show his keen awareness of the dynastic tensions brought out by the royal event. Howard Erskine-Hill notes that the widespread anxieties concerning the prospect of a Catholic succession meant that 'joy is ... balanced with an awareness of danger' even in the more overtly panegyric *Britannia Rediviva*.⁴³ In that poem Dryden's recognition that reality might prove incapable of matching expectations created a tension he was incapable of resolving. However, what undermines *Britannia Rediviva* helps strengthen *The Last Parting*. The Homeric text itself, when combined with a Virgilian colouring, provides a more successful framework within which to reflect upon the difficult past of the Stuarts and to acknowledge their contested future. By addressing the fixed status of Ascanius' destiny alongside the fluctuating fortunes of Astyanax, Dryden offered a hopeful vision of a stable dynasty. At the same time he acknowledged how the circumstances of recent Stuart family history, and a potential line of Catholic kings, made that future a deeply precarious one. The sense of glorious future that may never come to fruition that is expressed within the *Last Parting* episode corresponded to Dryden's uncertainty as to what the arrival of James Francis Edward might entail. The uncertain present created a range of alternative futures for the Stuarts. Some of these were triumphant, others more tragic. The translation neither entirely confirms nor entirely dismisses any of these futures; it was adaptable to a variety of potential contexts.

As it transpired, far from securing his position, James Francis Edward's birth helped hasten the loss of his father's crown and ensured that he ended up with no kingdom to inherit. This naturally emphasized the more tragic elements of *The Last Parting* for readers with Jacobite sympathies. The circumstances of its first publication encouraged such a response. Dryden's dedication of *Examen Poeticum* to the Catholic Jacobite Edward, Lord Radcliffe would have made Jacobite interpretations of individual poems in the collection more readily available. *Examen Poeticum* also contains Congreve's translation of Andromache's lament

for Hector in which the prospect of Astyanax's exile and death is first raised. This is printed prior to *The Last Parting* itself (*Examen Poeticum*, pp. 456-68); the futility of Hector's prayer would thus be more apparent for those who read the volume in sequence. Greg Clingham has discussed how Dryden translates *The Last Parting* under the influence of the sensibility which characterizes Andromache's later lament.⁴⁴ This gives the impression that the Hector and Andromache of *The Last Parting* share the hindsight of its translator and its readers. Here too, alternative futures are summoned up in order to draw attention to the tragedy of a pre-determined outcome.

Hindsight allows this melancholic reading of *The Last Parting* to appear dominant, even inevitable, but readers in the early 1690s could have discerned more hopeful elements. After 1688 Jacobites continued to draw on the claims of Trojan descent and *translatio imperii* to compose Stuart panegyric. The new historical reality, however, necessitated a modification to the myth's relocation aspect. Emphasis was placed on a homecoming, rather than on a journey to a new land or on moving from a culture's margins to its centre. This can claim Virgilian precedent as well. Italy is Aeneas' 'antiquam ... matrem' (*Aeneid* 3.96, 'ancient mother') because his ancestor, Dardanus, was born in Italy (3.163-8). His journey from Troy to Latium is thus a kind of homecoming. This provided a hopeful precedent for Jacobites for James II's return with his son and heir, even if it was to a land which he had left only a few years previously. This in turn correlated with the more recent historical precedent of Stuart exile and restoration during the mid-seventeenth century. It allowed the possibility that James Francis Edward could combine the most positive aspects of the Homeric Astyanax and the Virgilian Ascanius; Astyanax could survive without denying Ascanius his imperial glory.

Any celebratory elements of such works were necessarily proleptic: they lamented the Stuart cause, but held out hope that it would triumph again in the immediate future. Again, this was frequently signalled by engaging with Virgil. In 1691 the Scottish Jacobite Richard,

Lord Maitland (later Earl of Lauderdale), presented Mary of Modena with a manuscript translation of *Aeneid* 4, 6, and 8. In his dedication he states that he began the translation ‘above a year ago, when I durst not appear for the Usurpers’, and wishes that the translation may be ‘useful one day’ to James Francis Edward, ‘the Prince our rising hope’.⁴⁵ Here Maitland has combined several elements of Virgil’s Stuart loyalist reception. Partial translations of the *Aeneid* had been produced earlier in the century for the education of a Stuart heir, including Sir John Harington’s translation of *Aeneid* 6 that was presented in 1604 to James I’s heir apparent, Prince Henry.⁴⁶ Maitland’s reference to ‘the Prince our rising hope’ is probably an allusion to the *spes altera* motif. Elsewhere in the dedication Maitland drew on James Francis Edward’s descent from Ascanius more explicitly, but, unusually, he attributed it to his maternal rather than his paternal ancestry. ‘It is natural’, he writes, ‘to dedicate the Translation to your Majesty who is not only of the same Country but descended of the same family with Augustus Caesar’.⁴⁷ This claim of Estense descent from Ascanius appears to be Maitland’s innovation. It is possible that Maitland was unaware of the connection between Astyanax and the House of Este. What is more likely is that he did know of it but chose to gloss over it. The strength of Virgilian precedent ensured that Astyanax would still have been primarily associated with exile and death. Maitland hoped his translation prophesied a temporary exile and glorious restoration.

Transferring the Trojan connections to Mary rather than James also allowed Maitland to accommodate another, specifically Scottish, dynastic myth. As well as being the supposed descendants of Ascanius, the Stuarts also claimed descent from Fergus the Great, the legendary Celtic first king of Scotland. This tradition was revived under James’ reign to assert the antiquity of the Stuart claim to their northern kingdom, although Stuart loyalists were loath to abandon the Virgilian associations of Trojan connection altogether.⁴⁸ In fact, as Murray Pittock has demonstrated, the first Jacobites continued the seventeenth-century

association between Stuart loyalism and the *Aeneid* well into the eighteenth century, even as the prospect of a Stuart restoration became increasingly unlikely.⁴⁹

Dryden himself acknowledged that Maitland's *Aeneid* had influenced his own translation of the poem. In his *Aeneis* Dedication he records how 'having his Manuscript in my hands, I consulted it as often as I doubted of my Author's sense. For no Man understood *Virgil* better than that Learned Noble Man' (*Works*, V, 336-7). Here Dryden is referring to the full translation which Maitland had completed by 1695, rather than the partial translation dedicated to Mary of Modena. *The Last Parting*, however, does share noticeable affinities with Maitland's earlier translation, even though its focus on Astyanax ensures that it has a more resigned and melancholic tone. In *The Last Parting* the Virgilian tropes of exile, restoration, and *translatio imperii* serve to combine panegyric and elegy. The precise dynamic between these two modes could, however, only be established if the translation's exact composition date were known. Whether or not Dryden wrote *The Last Parting* after the crucial events of 1688, he would have been aware that, throughout the seventeenth century, poems which were initially intended as works of royal celebration frequently became poems of lamentation. Several poems written in honour of James and Mary's first son, Charles, called him an English Ascanius. Since Charles' life was so short it is likely the poems were begun in advance and only became lamentations retrospectively.⁵⁰ Some of Dryden's own panegyrics had acquired elegiac qualities soon after their publication. In 1684 Dryden translated Virgil's fourth Eclogue, a poem frequently used to celebrate the birth of a royal heir, in order to celebrate Princess Anne's first pregnancy. There too the prophecy experienced something of a tragic inversion: *Poems*, II, 203 notes how Anne gave birth to a daughter not long after Dryden's poem was published, but that the child was stillborn.

In many respects the birth of James Francis Edward provided a bitterly ironic setback to the Stuart succession. The shift from panegyric to elegy occurred through survival rather

than death; dynastic innovation came about because of, not despite, the presence of a male heir. Recalling Virgil's Ascanius in Homer's Astyanax allowed Dryden to acknowledge both the panegyric and elegiac elements of Astyanax's post-classical reception. However, it also helped to express how the elegiac Astyanax must, for a Jacobite, overshadow any panegyric incarnation as the founder of a powerful royal dynasty. It offered, and then denied, the prospect of an alternative future for both Astyanax and his descendants.

Dryden may, in fact, always have intended to draw on the language of Stuart panegyric to amplify *The Last Parting*'s pathos. This technique can also be found in earlier poems on Stuart heirs. The most immediate precedent is, again, the infant Charles' death in 1677. Robin Sowerby has discussed how this event prompted Knightley Chetwood's translation of the Hector and Andromache episode, which was the only previous stand-alone rendering prior to Dryden's.⁵¹ Another poem on Charles' death calls him the 'Royal BABE' and compares him to the 'Morning STAR', both of which were long-established tropes of Stuart panegyric.⁵² Dryden himself used both of them in *The Last Parting*: 'The Royal Babe upon her Breast was laid; | Who, like the Morning Star, his beams display'd' (38-9). The reference to Astyanax as the 'Royal Babe' also recalls Dryden's use of the same term in *Britannia Rediviva* (104, 164). Elsewhere Dryden calls Astyanax 'Th' Illustrious Babe' (154); this repeats an expression Thomas D'Urfey used to describe James Francis Edward in his own commendatory poem.⁵³ In the anonymously authored elegy on Charles, as in Chetwood's and Dryden's respective fatalistic readings of the last parting episode, knowledge of the outcome ensures that its melancholia is present from the start; it is not, as in D'Urfey's poem, created by later events.

Earlier elegies on lost royal heirs drew more overtly on the key Virgilian motifs present in *The Last Parting*. The premature death of Prince Henry in 1612 prompted a number of commemorative poems, several of them addressing Henry as *spes altera* to

enhance their note of tragedy and to indicate that the hopes he once represented are now dashed.⁵⁴ This reconfigured the more panegyric uses of this phrase which appeared in connection with Henry at the start of his father's reign when he seemed to represent a bright, hopeful future. At James' entry into London as part of his 1604 coronation, for example, the triumphal arch dedicated to his wife and children was decorated with the motto *spes altera*.⁵⁵ It is likely, therefore, that Dryden's own rendering of Homer owed more to the tradition of elegy that consciously reworked panegyric than it did to panegyric which found itself becoming elegiac. His allusions to more straightforwardly celebratory poems on James Francis Edward's birth help support this reading.

Dryden, however, like other Jacobites such as Maitland, held out some hope well into the 1690s that the fortunes of the Stuarts would imitate the more positive narratives of their Trojan ancestors. He writes to Tonson in February 1697:

My Translation of Virgil is already in the Press and I can not possibly deferr the publication of it any Longer than Midsummer Term at farthes [*sic*]. I have hinder'd it thus long in hopes of his return, for whom, and for my Conscience I have sufferd, that I might have layd my Authour at his feet⁵⁶

Such an event would have activated the more optimistic aspects of *The Last Parting*. The complex interplay within the translation between Astyanax, Ascanius, and James Francis Edward allows this possibility even whilst acknowledging that this was already wishful thinking. Political realities meant that hopes of a restoration were as fervently desired, and as unlikely to be realized, as the future Hector wishes for Astyanax. If James II and his son offered any hopes to their supporters after 1688, such hopes belonged to a mythic past and to an increasingly fictitious future.

* * *

Dryden dwelt on the Trojan ancestry of the Stuarts for more than purely elegiac or sentimental reasons. It also allowed him to affirm the inheritance and transferral of poetic *imperium* from Homer, via Virgil, to himself. This reading, as with the Jacobite interpretation of *The Last Parting*, emerges from placing the poem within the context of Dryden's other poetry rather than from any explicit statement in the translation itself. In *Mac Flecknoe* Dryden drew on Virgilian aspects of Stuart panegyric to increase the mock-heroic atmosphere of Shadwell's coronation. Shadwell is the 'young *Ascanius*' to Flecknoe's Aeneas, and Dryden advances this connection by imitating the *spes altera* motif: Shadwell is 'Rome's other hope' (108-9). The connection creates an impression of Shadwell as a false Ascanius to the throne of true poetry, and additionally as the Ascanius of Dullness. Here too the events of 1688 necessitated a recalibration of this Virgilian motif. By succeeding Dryden as poet laureate, Shadwell had prevented Dryden from helping Congreve, the figure he considered to be his true literary son and heir, from being recognized as his official successor. This association was, however, still widely acknowledged, largely thanks to the example of *Mac Flecknoe*. In a 1694 poem Addison calls Congreve 'the Muses other Hope'; the anonymous author of *An Epistle to Sir Richard Blackmore* refers to Congreve as a 'young *Ascanius*'.⁵⁷ The *Epistle* combines poetic and political lineages, and glosses over Congreve's Whiggism, to call him an 'abdicated Prince' and '*Poetick Prince of Wales*' (p. 7).

James Winn has considered why it was only in 1692 that Dryden acknowledged his authorship of *Mac Flecknoe*. Winn argues that Dryden was revenging himself on the recently deceased Shadwell, who had used the office of laureate to hinder the career of his predecessor.⁵⁸ It is also likely that by doing so Dryden was reasserting the claims of his own literary lineage that had been usurped by Shadwell (and his line) in 1688. Dryden's 'To My Dear Friend, Mr. Congreve', written six months after the publication of *Examen Poeticum*,

reworks the coronation passage of *Mac Flecknoe* to such an extent that Earl Miner has argued that Dryden was ‘seriously parodying his own earlier poem’.⁵⁹ Dryden tells Congreve ‘only You are lineal to the Throne’, and that he will soon be seen ‘High on the Throne of Wit’ (44, 53) irrespective of whatever official poetical position he may or may not hold.

Dryden used *Mac Flecknoe* in his poem to Congreve and in his translations to reflect on his own career and to present himself as the latest in an illustrious line of national poets – including Virgil, Boiardo, Ariosto, Ronsard, Racine, Tasso, and Spenser - who had drawn on the *translatio imperii* tradition when celebrating their respective royal patrons. Dryden also included Milton in this dynasty, despite the major obstacle of his republicanism. He was able to do so thanks to Milton’s engagement with his epic predecessors in *Paradise Lost*, and also because of the poem’s status as a vernacular epic on a genealogical subject. Milton provides the ancestry, not of a nation or of a dynasty, but of humanity. For Dryden this demonstrated a *translatio imperii* from Virgil to his true, British, descendants. Dryden felt able to claim this poetic lineage was more stable than the royal dynasties which their works commemorated. Translation allowed Dryden to demonstrate that the legitimacy of his claim to poetic *imperium* derived from this inheritance, even if he did not possess its physical trappings.

This context could also inform Dryden’s use of *spes altera* in his account of Astyanax in *The Last Parting*; it may apply to Congreve as well as to James Francis Edward Stuart. In the *Examen Poeticum* dedication Dryden praises Congreve’s *Iliad* translations and expresses the wish that he ‘had the leisure to Translate him [Homer], and the World the good Nature and Justice, to Encourage him in that Noble Design, of which he is more capable than any Man I know’ (*Works*, IV, 374). Dryden felt that Congreve could assert his patrimony by completing a translation of Homer. By doing so Congreve could combine the best elements of Astyanax’s and Ascanius’ fates in a manner which had proved impossible for James Francis Edward. Later in the decade Dryden revised this position by entertaining hopes of

translating Homer himself: in the Preface to *Fables* he announces ‘If it shall please God to give me longer Life, and moderate Health, my Intentions are to translate the whole *Ilias*’ (*Works*, VII, 28). Despite this, he still thought of Congreve as his poetic heir.

In the event neither Dryden nor Congreve produced a full-scale rendering of Homer. This might suggest an appropriate, if unfortunate, parallel with the failed hopes of the Jacobites. However, a desire to claim a Drydenian heritage does inform the translation of Homer by Dryden’s self-proclaimed successor, Alexander Pope. It was Pope, and not Congreve, who eventually combined the fates of Astyanax and Ascanius in a positive manner. He did so through his translation of the *Iliad*. Pope was able to present himself as Dryden’s *spes altera* because he proved more successful than other claimants to this title: he surpassed his (poetic) father, and drowned his fame as a translator of Homer.

University of Bristol

¹ *Iliad*, edited by A. T. Murray, revised edition, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1999), 6.369-500.

² Dryden is quoted throughout from *The Works of John Dryden*, edited by H. T. Swedenberg Jr et al., 20 vols (Berkeley, CA, 1956-2000; hereafter ‘*Works*’). *The Last Parting* appears in Vol. IV, pp. 425-31.

³ See Howard Erskine-Hill, *Poetry of Opposition and Revolution: Dryden to Wordsworth* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 59-60, and Robin Sowerby, “‘The Last Parting of Hector and Andromache’”, in *John Dryden: Tercentenary Essays*, edited by Paul Hammond and David Hopkins (Oxford, 2000), pp. 240-63 (pp. 255-7).

⁴ *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*, edited by Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, 3 vols (Leipzig, 1878-1902); my translation.

⁵ I draw upon Howard D. Weinbrot, ‘Apocalyptic Satire, James II and Transubstantiation: Pulpit, Polemics and the *Declaration of Indulgence*’, *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 39 (2016), 315-34 (pp. 325-8).

⁶ See Jacques Le Goff, *Medieval Civilization*, translated by Julia Barrow (Oxford, 1998), pp. 3-36, 171-2.

⁷ For ease of reference Virgil is quoted from *Eclogues; Georgics; Aeneid*, edited by H. Rushton Fairclough, revised edition, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1999). All prose translations from Virgil are my own. All Virgil quotations have been checked against Dryden's own preferred edition: *Opera P. Virgilii Maronis*, edited by Ruaeus, 2nd edn (London, 1687). There are differences of lineation and of orthography between these versions but there are no textual discrepancies in need of recording in any of the quotations given in this article.

⁸ For Dryden's presentation of Restoration London as a new imperial capital, see Laura Brown, 'Dryden and the Imperial Imagination', in *The Cambridge Companion to John Dryden*, edited by Steven Zwicker (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 59-74 (pp. 66-7).

⁹ R. E. Asher, *National Myths in Renaissance France* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. 9-10, 36.

¹⁰ For details see Susanna Phillippo, "'A Future for Astyanax": Alternative and Imagined Futures for Hector's Son in Classical and European Drama', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 14 (2007), 321-74.

¹¹ Jean Racine, *Andromaque* (Paris, 2004), p. 14; *Andromaque*, translated by John Cairncross (Harmondsworth, 1967), p. 44 (adapted).

¹² As discussed in Sowerby, 'The Last Parting', p. 249.

¹³ Matteo Maria Boiardo, *Orlando Innamorato*, translated by Charles Stanley Ross (Berkeley, CA, 1989). For Ariosto's use of the tradition, see *Orlando furioso*, edited by Lanfranco Caretti (Milan, 1954), I.3-4, XXXVI.69.

¹⁴ See Torquato Tasso, *The Liberation of Jerusalem*, translated by Max Wickert, edited by Mark Davie (Oxford, 2009), X.73-6.

¹⁵ I draw here on Michael Sherberg, *Rinaldo: Character and Intertext in Ariosto and Tasso* (Saratoga, CA, 1993), pp. 107-8.

¹⁶ Mary was descended from an illegitimate branch of the family which had been legitimated following the death without heirs of Alonzo II, Ariosto's patron.

¹⁷ See G. S. Gordon, 'The Trojans in Britain', *Essays and Studies*, 9 (1924), 9-30 (pp. 11-12).

¹⁸ Brutus' ancestry is given in Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, edited and translated by Lewis Thorpe (Harmondsworth, 1966), I.3 (pp. 54-5). Geoffrey documents Brutus' arrival in Britain at I.15-16 (pp. 71-2), and outlines Brutus' status as the father of a royal line at II.1 (p. 75).

¹⁹ For early detractors of Geoffrey, see Robert Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 34, 50.

²⁰ See Polydore Vergil, *Angliae Historiae* (Basle, 1555), I.19-21.

²¹ Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles* (London, 1577), Chs. 2-3. For other sixteenth-century historians who sanctioned the Brutus myth, see Mayer, p. 40.

²² Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, edited by A. C. Hamilton (Harlow, 2001), 2.x.9.6-7.

²³ *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, edited by Douglas Bush *et al.*, 8 vols (New Haven, CT, 1953-82), V.1, 3.

²⁴ *John Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*, edited by John Carey, 2nd edn (Harlow, 1998), pp. 278-9; my translation.

²⁵ Nicholas von Maltzahn, *Milton's 'History of Britain': Republican Historiography in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1991), p. 92, argues instead that Milton grew disillusioned with the sources of the myth, rather than its royalist application.

²⁶ The influence of Virgil on the poetics of Dryden and other 'Augustan' writers is outlined in Robin Sowerby, *The Augustan Art of Poetry: Augustan Translation of the Classics* (Oxford, 2006).

²⁷ In this procedure for this and other passages quoted from Dryden's translation I draw on the commentary on *The Last Parting* in *The Poems of John Dryden*, edited by Paul Hammond and David Hopkins, 5 vols (London, 1995-2005; hereafter '*Poems*'), IV, 313-25.

²⁸ For its earliest appearance, see John Leland, *Genethliacon* (London, 1543), sig. C4^v, which calls Henry VIII's infant son Edward the *spes altera* of the nation.

²⁹ Recorded in John Ogilby, *The Relation of his Majesties Entertainment Passing through the City of London, to his Coronation* (London, 1661), p. 13.

³⁰ See *The Letters of John Dryden*, edited by Charles E. Ward (New York, 1965), p. 50.

³¹ Erskine-Hill, *Poetry of Opposition and Revolution* (n. 3), p. 60.

³² Thomas Otway, *Epilogue to Her Royal Highness, on Her Return from Scotland* (London, 1682).

³³ *A Congratulatory Poem To her Royal Highness: Upon the Arrival of Their Royal Highness's in England, May the 27th, 1682* (London, 1682), p. 2.

³⁴ *Catholick Hymn on the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (London, 1688), p. 1.

³⁵ *Strenæ Natalitiæ Academiæ Oxoniensis in Celsissimum Principem* (Oxford, 1688); *Illustrissimi Principis Ducis Cornubiæ et Comites Palatini, &c., Genethliacon* (Cambridge, 1688).

³⁶ 'To the Queen, on the birth of the Duke of Cornwall', *Illustrissimi*, sig. b1^r.

³⁷ John Baber, *To the King, Upon the Queens being Deliver'd of a Son, June the 10th. MDCLXXXVIII. A Poem* (London, 1688), p. 2.

³⁸ See Sowerby, 'The Last Parting' (n. 3), p. 256.

³⁹ See further Elizabeth M. Tyler, 'Trojans in Anglo-Saxon England: Precedent without Descent', *RES*, 64 (2013), 1-20.

⁴⁰ Kellie Robertson, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Translation of Insular Historiography', *Arthuriana*, 8.4 (1998), 42-57 (p. 50).

⁴¹ For the later Plantagenets See Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 25. For Henry VI see Schwyzer, pp. 13-18, and Thomas Penn, *Winter King: The Dawn of Tudor England* (London, 2012), pp. 7-8.

⁴² As is outlined by Schwyzer, pp. 151-2.

⁴³ Howard Erskine-Hill, *Poetry and the Realm of Politics: Shakespeare to Dryden* (Oxford, 1996), p. 184.

⁴⁴ Greg Clingham, 'Translating Difference: The Example of Dryden's "Last Parting of Hector and Andromache"', *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 33 (2000), 45-70 (p. 54).

⁴⁵ Quoted in Erskine-Hill, *Poetry and the Realm of Politics*, p. 202.

⁴⁶ For the politics lying behind this and other earlier seventeenth-century *Aeneid* translations, see Sheldon Brammall, *The English 'Aeneid': Translations of Virgil, 1555-1646* (Edinburgh, 2015).

⁴⁷ Quoted in Murray Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 29.

⁴⁸ Discussed in Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, pp. 16-17.

⁴⁹ See Murray Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, p. 7, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke, 2013), pp. 18, 72.

⁵⁰ Discussed in Sowerby, 'The Last Parting', p. 255.

⁵¹ Sowerby, 'The Last Parting', pp. 254-5.

⁵² *An Elegy On the Death of the Duke of Cambridge* (London, 1678). *Poems*, IV, 317 records earlier uses of the morning star in Stuart panegyric.

⁵³ Thomas D'Urfey, *A Poem Congratulatory on the Birth of the Young Prince, Most Humbly Dedicated to Their August Majesties King James, and Queen Mary* (London, 1688), p. 8.

⁵⁴ See *Luctus posthumus* (Oxford, 1612), pp. 22, 35.

⁵⁵ Documented in Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment* (London, 1604), sig. C1^v.

⁵⁶ *Letters of Dryden* (n. 30), pp. 85-6.

⁵⁷ Joseph Addison, 'An Account of the Greatest English Poets', in *The Annual Miscellany for the Year 1694* (London, 1694), pp. 317-27 (p. 325), and *An Epistle to Sir Richard Blackmore, Occasion'd by The New Session of the Poets* (London, 1700), p. 7.

⁵⁸ James Winn, *John Dryden and his World* (New Haven, CT, 1987), pp. 460-1.

⁵⁹ Earl Miner, 'Introduction: borrowed plumage, varied umbrage', in *Literary Transmission and Authority: Dryden and other Writers*, edited by Earl Miner and Jennifer Brady (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 1-26 (p. 17).